

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-2175**

---

CACIE BIDDLE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FAIRMONT SUPPLY COMPANY, a foreign corporation,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

CONSOL ENERGY, INCORPORATED, a foreign corporation,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern  
District of West Virginia, at Clarksburg. Frederick P. Stamp,  
Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:14-cv-00122-FPS-JSK)

---

Submitted: April 29, 2016

Decided: May 19, 2016

---

Before GREGORY, KEENAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Amanda J. Taylor, LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN P. NEW, Beckley, West  
Virginia, for Appellant. Larry J. Rector, STEPTOE & JOHNSON,  
PLLC, Bridgeport, West Virginia, Denielle M. Stritch, STEPTOE &  
JOHNSON, PLLC, Morgantown, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Cacie Biddle filed suit in state court alleging Fairmont Supply Company ("Fairmont") unlawfully terminated her employment under West Virginia common law and the West Virginia Human Rights Act (WVHRA). Specifically, Biddle alleged gender discrimination, retaliation, and hostile work environment claims. Fairmont removed the action to district court. Biddle now appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Fairmont on all claims.

We review a district court's grant of summary judgment de novo, viewing the facts and drawing reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. Smith v. Gilchrist, 749 F.3d 302, 307 (4th Cir. 2014). Summary judgment is appropriate when "the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). The relevant inquiry is "whether the evidence presents a sufficient disagreement to require submission to a jury or whether it is so one-sided that one party must prevail as a matter of law." Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 251-52 (1986).

With these standards in mind, we have reviewed the parties' briefs, the material submitted in the joint appendix, and the district court's order, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district

court. Biddle v. Fairmont Supply Co., No. 1:14-cv-00122-FPS-JSK (N.D. W. Va. Sept. 24, 2015). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED